TABLE 13
CROSSTABULATION OF VOTING BEHAVIOR AND FACULTY SELECTION OF THE "MOST UNION-ORIENTED" ASSOCIATION

Voting Behavior	Most Union-Oriented: APSCUF-PAHE #	%	AAUP[a] #	%	AFT #	%	Total #	%
APSCUF-PAHE	47	7.5	5	0.8	577	91.7	629	100.0
AAUP	33	8.8	3	0.8	341	90.5	377	100.0
AFT	1	2.3	0	0	42	97.7	43	100.0
No Rep	4	8.3	0	0	44	91.7	48	100.0
Column Total	85	7.7	8	0.7	1004	91.5	1097	100.0

$\chi^2 = 3.158^a$, df = 6
p = 0.7887

[a]The contingency table contained cells with expected frequencies of less than 1 and more than 20 percent of the cells had expected frequencies less than 5. However, since other 2 x 4 contingency table combinations also produced nonsignificant χ^2, the χ^2 statistic for the entire table is reported. (See footnote 1, Table 12.)

TABLE 14
CROSSTABULATION OF VOTING BEHAVIOR AND FACULTY SELECTION OF THE "MOST PROFESSIONALLY ORIENTED" ASSOCIATION

Voting Behavior	Most Professionally Oriented: APSCUF-PAHE #	%	AAUP #	%	AFT[a] #	%	Total #	%
APSCUF-PAHE	358	56.6	271	42.8	4	0.6	633	100.0
AAUP	14	3.7	366	96.3	0	0	380	100.0
AFT	5	11.6	34	79.1	4	9.3	43	100.0
No Rep	8	16.7	40	83.3	0	0	48	100.0
Column Total	385	34.9	711	64.4	8	0.7	1104	100.0

$\chi^2 = 311.7^a$, df = 3
$p < 0.001$

[a]See footnote a for Table 12.

TABLE 15

CROSSTABULATION OF VOTING BEHAVIOR AND FACULTY SELECTION OF THE ASSOCIATION "HISTORICALLY COMMITTED TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING"

Voting Behavior	Historical Commitment: APSCUF-PAHE #	APSCUF-PAHE %	AAUP #	AAUP %	AFT #	AFT %	Total #	Total %
APSCUF-PAHE	192	30.9	39	6.3	391	62.9	622	100.0
AAUP	50	13.5	37	10.0	283	76.5	370	100.0
AFT	1	2.3	1	2.3	42	95.5	44	100.0
No Rep	8	17.0	3	6.4	36	76.6	47	100.0
Column Total	251	23.2	80	7.4	752	69.4	1083	100.0

$X^2 = 57.098$, df = 6

$p < 0.001$

TABLE 16
CROSSTABULATION OF VOTING BEHAVIOR AND FACULTY SELECTION OF THE ASSOCIATION WITH THE "GREATEST NATIONAL VISIBILITY"

	Greatest National Visibility							
Voting Behavior	APSCUF-PAHE		AAUP		AFT		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
APSCUF-PAHE	228	36.1	302	47.9	101	16.0	631	100.0
AAUP	56	15.0	249	66.6	69	18.4	374	100.0
AFT	5	11.4	20	45.5	19	43.2	44	100.0
No Rep	3	6.3	27	56.3	18	37.5	48	100.0
Column Total	292	26.6	598	54.5	207	18.9	1097	100.0

$X^2 = 93.029$, df = 6
$p < 0.001$.

TABLE 17
CROSSTABULATION OF VOTING BEHAVIOR AND FACULTY SELECTION OF THE ASSOCIATION WITH THE "GREATEST VISIBILITY WITHIN PENNSYLVANIA"

Voting Behavior	Greatest Pennsylvania Visibility: APSCUF-PAHE #	APSCUF-PAHE %	AAUP #	AAUP %	AFT #	AFT %	Total #	Total %
APSCUF-PAHE	615	97.0	7	1.1	12	1.9	634	100.0
AAUP	309	81.7	49	13.0	20	5.3	378	100.0
AFT[a]	37	84.1	1	2.3	6	13.6	44	100.0
No Rep[a]	45	93.8	1	2.1	2	4.2	48	100.0
Column Total	1006	91.1	58	5.3	40	3.6	1104	100.0

$X^2 = 75.02^a$, df = 2
$p < 0.001$

[a]Low expected frequencies in the cells for AFT and No Rep Voting Behavior necessitated their elimination from calculation of the X^2 statistic. The reported X^2 is for a 2 x 3 contingency table. (See footnote 1, Table 12.)

TABLE 18
CROSSTABULATION OF VOTING BEHAVIOR AND FACULTY SELECTION OF THE ASSOCIATION WHICH IS "LEAST LIKELY TO STRIKE"

	Least Likely to Strike							
Voting Behavior	APSCUF-PAHE		AAUP		AFT		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
APSCUF-PAHE	228	36.6	368	59.1	27	4.3	623	100.0
AAUP	63	17.0	292	78.7	16	4.3	371	100.0
AFT	10	23.3	31	72.1	2	4.7	43	100.0
No Rep	4	8.3	42	87.5	2	4.2	48	100.0
Column Total	305	28.1	733	67.6	47	4.3	1085	100.0

$X^2 = 55.789$, df = 6
$p < 0.001$

TABLE 19
CROSSTABULATION OF VOTING BEHAVIOR AND FACULTY SELECTION OF THE ASSOCIATION WITH THE "GREATEST LOBBYING POTENTIAL IN HARRISBURG"

	Greatest Lobbying Potential							
Voting Behavior	APSCUF-PAHE		AAUP		AFT		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
APSCUF-PAHE	624	98.0	1	0.2	12	1.9	637	100.0
AAUP	271	73.0	45	12.1	55	14.8	371	100.0
AFT	27	61.4	0	0	17	38.6	44	100.0
No Rep[a]	40	83.3	2	4.2	6	12.5	48	100.0
Column Total	962	87.5	48	4.4	90	8.2	1100	100.0

$X^2 = 202.376$,[a] df = 4
$p < 0.001$

[a]Low expected frequencies necessitated elimination of the No Rep category and calculation of the X^2 statistic for a 3 x 3 contingency table. (See footnote 1, Table 12.)

TABLE 20
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POTENTIAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ISSUES RANKED FROM MOST TO LEAST SATISFIED

Issue	Mean Ranks[b] All Respondents	APSCUF-PAHE	AAUP	AFT	No Rep
Academic Freedom*[a]	2.22	2.03	2.55	2.29	2.09
Conditions of Employment#	3.04	3.01	3.09	3.09	3.09
Faculty Participation in Governance †	3.74	3.65	3.83	3.91	4.21
Faculty Personnel Policies**	3.82	3.89	3.70	4.03	3.48
Financial Benefits##	3.87	4.17	3.44	3.88	3.26
Determination of Institutional Mission ††	4.31	4.25	4.39	3.79	4.86

*F = 9.275	#F = 0.175	†F = 2.685	**F = 2.487	##F = 12.603	††F = 3.233
p< 0.001	p = 0.914	p = 0.045	p = 0.059	p< 0.001	p = 0.022
df = 3,958	df = 3,958	df = 3,958	df = 3,958	df = 3,958	df = 3,958

[a]Bartlett's test for homogeneous variances significant; the respective F-like statistic was as follows: F′ = 8.152, p < 0.001.

[b]Scale: 1 = most satisfied; 6 = least satisfied.

TABLE 21
POST HOC COMPARISON OF POTENTIAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ISSUES RANKED FROM MOST TO LEAST SATISFIED*

Issue	APSCUF-PAHE	No Rep	AFT	AAUP
Academic Freedom	2.03	2.09	2.29	2.55
Conditions of Employment	APSCUF-PAHE	AAUP	AFT	No Rep
	3.01	3.09	3.09	3.09
Faculty Participation in Governance	APSCUF-PAHE	AAUP	AFT	No Rep
	3.65	3.83	3.91	4.21
Faculty Personnel Policies	No Rep	AAUP	APSCUF-PAHE	AFT
	3.48	3.70	3.89	4.03
Financial Benefits	No Rep	AAUP	AFT	APSCUF-PAHE
	3.26	3.44	3.88	4.17
Determination of Institutional Mission	AFT	APSCUF-PAHE	AAUP	No Rep
	3.79	4.25	4.39	4.86

*The underlining notation is used to indicate those differences between or among means which are not significant.

TABLE 22
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POTENTIAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ISSUES RANKED FROM SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED TO SHOULD NOT BE NEGOTIATED

Issues	Mean Ranks[b] All Respondents	APSCUF-PAHE	AAUP	AFT	No Rep
Financial Benefits*[a]	1.86	1.71	2.07	2.00	2.33
Conditions of Employment#	2.90	2.77	3.12	3.17	2.85
Faculty Personnel Policies †[a]	3.24	3.16	3.39	3.14	3.33
Faculty Participation in Governance**	4.03	4.14	3.87	3.89	3.95
Academic Freedom##	4.06	4.28	3.71	4.09	3.79
Determination of Institutional Mission ††[a]	4.90	4.95	4.85	4.71	4.74

*F = 6.562	#F = 5.490	†F = 2.406	**F = 2.881	##F = 9.362	††F = 0.642
p< 0.001	p = 0.001	p = 0.066	p = 0.035	p< 0.001	p = 0.588
df = 3,955	df = 3,955	df = 3,955	df = 3,955	df = 3,955	df = 3,955

[a]Bartlett's test for homogeneous variances significant; the respective F-like statistics were as follows: *F' = 5.4271, p = .003; †F' = 2.4646, p = .076; ##F' = 8.6365, p< 0.001; ††F' = .5985, p > .05.

[b]Scale: 1 = should be negotiated; 6 = should not be negotiated.

TABLE 23
POST HOC COMPARISON OF POTENTIAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ISSUES RANKED FROM SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED TO SHOULD NOT BE NEGOTIATED*

Issue	APSCUF-PAHE	AFT	AAUP	No Rep
Financial Benefits	1.71	2.00	2.07	2.33
Conditions of Employment	APSCUF-PAHE	No Rep	AAUP	AFT
	2.77	2.85	3.12	3.17
Faculty Personnel Policies	AFT	APSCUF-PAHE	No Rep	AAUP
	3.14	3.16	3.33	3.39
Faculty Participation in Governance	AAUP	AFT	No Rep	APSCUF-PAHE
	3.87	3.89	3.95	4.14
Academic Freedom	AAUP	No Rep	AAUP	APSCUF-PAHE
	3.71	3.79	4.09	4.28
Determination of Institutional Mission	AFT	No Rep	AAUP	APSCUF-PAHE
	4.71	4.74	4.85	4.95

*The underlining notation is used to indicate those differences between or among means which are not significant.

TABLE 24
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RANKED STATEMENTS EXPRESSING RESPONDENTS' ATTITUDES ABOUT FACULTY USE OF THE STRIKE

Statement	All Respondents	APSCUF-PAHE	AAUP	AFT	No Rep
1. Faculty members should utilize the strike as an appropriate sanction after other legal recourse to mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration have failed to resolve grievances.*[a]	1.99	1.99	2.00	1.12	2.57
2. The strike is an unprofessional sanction and under no circumstances should faculty members withhold their services.#[a]	2.77	2.75	2.79	3.76	1.98
3. Strikes on the part of faculty members are generally undesirable and should be averted for the majority of grievances.†[a]	1.71	1.66	1.72	2.32	1.71
4. In cases where the breadth of disagreement between faculty members and the state is great faculty should strike even before satisfying Act 195 requirements for mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration.**[a]	3.54	3.60	3.48	2.79	3.74

*F = 17.059	#F = 17.422	†F = 11.409	**F = 17.040
p< 0.001	p< 0.001	p< 0.001	p< 0.001
df = 3,946	df = 3,948	df = 3,948	df = 3,948

[a]Bartlett's test for homogeneous variances significant; the respective F-like statistics were as follows: *F' = 52.09, p< 0.001; #F' = 30.472, p < 0.001; †F' = 13.4042, p< 0.001; **F' = 17.9858, p< 0.001

[b]Scale: 1 = most agreement with the statement; 4 = least agreement with the statement.

TABLE 25

POST HOC COMPARISON OF RANKED STATEMENTS

EXPRESSING RESPONDENTS' ATTITUDES ABOUT FACULTY USE OF THE STRIKE*

Statement				
1. Faculty members should utilize the strike as an appropriate sanction after other legal recourse to mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration have failed to resolve grievances.	AFT 1.12	APSCUF-PAHE 1.99	AAUP 2.00	No Rep 2.57
2. The strike is an unprofessional sanction and under no circumstances should faculty members withhold their services.	No Rep 1.98	APSCUF-PAHE 2.75	AAUP 2.79	AFT 3.76
3. Strikes on the part of faculty members are generally undesirable and should be averted for the majority of grievances.	APSCUF-PAHE 1.66	No Rep 1.71	AAUP 1.72	AFT 2.32
4. In cases where the breadth of disagreements between faculty members and the state is great, faculty should strike even before satisfying Act 195 requirements for mediation, fact-finding, and arbitration.	AFT 2.79	AAUP 3.48	APSCUF-PAHE 3.60	No Rep 3.74

*The underlining notation is used to indicate those differences between or among means which are not significant.

TABLE 26
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RANKED STATEMENTS
EXPRESSING RESPONDENTS' ATTITUDES ABOUT INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL GOVERNANCE
INFLUENCES UPON THEIR VOTE

Statements	All Respondents	APSCUF-PAHE	AAUP	AFT	No Rep
1. The association I voted for can best represent faculty interests in the state legislature and state government.*[a]	2.28	1.65	3.19	2.53	4.09
2. The state government and legislature have not responded to the needs of either the Pennsylvania state-owned institutions or the faculty of these institutions.#[a]	2.55	2.50	2.59	2.41	3.09
3. Greater attention should be given to means other than collective bargaining for faculty self-government and sharing of decision making with my institution's president and board of trustees.†[a]	3.70	3.97	3.34	4.97	1.44
4. My institution's president and board of trustees do not have sufficient authority to respond to the needs and welfare of the faculty of the Pennsylvania state-owned institutions.**[a]	3.73	3.63	3.89	4.28	3.28

TABLE 26 (Cont.)

Statement	All Respondents	APSCUF-PAHE	AAUP	AFT	No Rep
5. The administrative staff of my institution have far too much authority in the affairs which should be determined by the faculty.##a	4.19	4.50	3.70	3.25	4.09
6. Internal agents such as my institution's president and board of trustees have not responded to the needs and welfare of the faculty at my institution.††a	4.57	4.75	4.29	3.62	5.06

*F = 102.886	#F = 2.197	†F = 46.009	**F = 4.876	## F = 23.962	††F = 11.941
p<0.001	p = 0.087	p<0.001	p = 0.002	p<0.001	p<0.001
df = 3,911	df = 3,911	df = 3,911	df = 3,911	df = 3,911	df = 3,911

[a]Bartlett's test for homogeneous variances significant; the respective F-like statistics were as follows: *F' = 83.9363, p < 0.001; #F' = 2.8630, p = .046; †F' = 86.7567, p<0.001; **F' = 4.9316, p = .004; ##F' = 22.3557, p<0.001; ††F' = 10.7795, p<0.001.

[b]Scale: 1 = most influential on vote; 6 = least influential on vote.

TABLE 27
POST HOC COMPARISON OF RANKED STATEMENTS
EXPRESSING RESPONDENTS' ATTITUDES ABOUT INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL GOVERNANCE
INFLUENCE UPON THEIR VOTE*

Statement				
1. The association I voted for can best represent faculty interests in the state legislature and state government.	APSCUF-PAHE 1.65	AFT 2.53	AAUP 3.19	No Rep 4.09
2. The state government and legislature have not responded to the needs of either the Pennsylvania state-owned institutions or the faculty of these institutions.	APSCUF-PAHE 2.50	AFT 2.41	AAUP 2.59	No Rep 3.09
3. Greater attention should be given to means other than collective bargaining for faculty self-government and sharing of decision making with my institution's president and board of trustees.	No Rep 1.44	AAUP 3.34	APSCUF-PAHE 3.97	AFT 4.97
4. My institution's president and board of trustees do not have sufficient authority to respond to the needs and welfare of the faculty of the Pennsylvania state-owned institutions.	No Rep 3.28	APSCUF-PAHE 3.63	AAUP 3.89	AFT 4.28

*The underlining notation is used to indicate those differences between or among means which are not significant.

TABLE 27 (Cont.)

Statement				
5. The administrative staff of my institution have too much authority in the affairs which should be determined by the faculty.	AFT 3.25	AAUP 3.70	No Rep 4.09	APSCUF-PAHE 4.50
6. Internal agents such as my institution's president and board of trustees have not responded to the needs and welfare of the faculty at my institution.	AFT 3.62	AAUP 4.29	APSCUF-PAHE 4.75	No Rep 5.06

TABLE 29

DATA FOR RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS FOR YEARS OF SERVICE AT THEIR INSTITUTION, ACADEMIC RANK, AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE

	N	Mean Years of Service	Standard Deviation
Respondents	1216	5.666	5.042
Nonrespondents	201	4.793	3.051

Behrens-Fisher t' = 1.4931 (nonsignificant), $p<.05$

Academic Rank

	Professor		Associate		Assistant	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Respondents	308	25.2	478	39.1	343	28.0
Nonrespondents	8	17.4	13	28.3	19	41.3

Discipline

	Arts & Humanities		Education		Social Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Respondents	408	33.4	371	30.4	179	14.7
Nonrespondents	17	36.9	13	28.3	4	8.7

	Instructor & Librarian*	
	N	%
Respondents	95	7.8
Nonrespondents	6	13.0

$\chi^2 = 7.024$ (nonsignificant)

	Business		Science	
	N	%	N	%
Respondents	28	2.3	235	19.3
Nonrespondents	1	2.2	11	23.9

$\chi^2 = 1.880$ (nonsignificant), df = 4

*Because of low expected frequencies, the instructor and librarian categories were pooled for the chi-square calculation for Academic Rank.

TABLE 30
COMPARISON OF THE POPULATION DISTRIBUTION AND THE FOUR MAILING DISTRIBUTIONS FOR VOTING BEHAVIOR AND ACADEMIC RANK

VOTING BEHAVIOR

	APSCUF-PAHE		AAUP		AFT		No Rep.		
	N	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	Total %
Population	2009	55.5	1282	35.4	158	4.4	169	4.7	100.0
First Mailing[a]	314	57.7	178	32.7	23	4.3	29	5.3	100.0
Second Mailing[b]	110	59.5	56	30.3	8	4.3	11	5.9	100.0
Third Mailing[c]	173	55.8	115	37.1	11	3.5	11	3.5	100.0
Fourth Mailing[d]	62	60.2	34	33.0	2	1.9	5	4.9	100.0

[a] $\chi^2 = 2.08$ (nonsignificant), df = 3; [b] $\chi^2 = 2.52$ (nonsignificant), df = 3;
[c] $\chi^2 = 1.64$ (nonsignificant), df = 3; [d] $\chi^2 = 1.99$ (nonsignificant), df = 3.

ACADEMIC RANK

	Professor		Associate		Assistant		Instructor & Librarian		
	N	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	Total %
Population	909	22.2	1578	38.5	1224	29.9	389	9.5	100.0
First Mailing[a]	167	29.4	290	36.8	156	27.5	36	6.3	100.0
Second Mailing[b]	48	24.4	76	38.6	54	27.4	19	9.6	100.0
Third Mailing[c]	66	19.2	148	43.0	100	29.1	30	8.7	100.0
Fourth Mailing[d]	27	23.5	45	39.1	33	28.7	10	8.7	100.0

[a] $\chi^2 = 20.80$ (significant), df = 3; [b] $\chi^2 = 0.83$ (nonsignificant), df = 3;
[c] $\chi^2 = 3.53$ (nonsignificant), df = 3; [d] $\chi^2 = 0.23$ (nonsignificant), df = 3.

*Because of low expected frequencies, the instructor and librarian categories were pooled for the chi-square calculation.

Appendix B:

Tests of the Reliability of the Sampling Distribution of Respondents

This section discusses the additional procedures used to account for the reliability of the sampling distribution of respondents. The first procedure used was a theoretical test of proportions of the relationship between the distribution of the population and the sample of respondents by academic rank. This test produced a significant result (see Table 28) and potential questions about the reliability. The major contributing factor to this result was the three percentage point difference in the number of full professors in the corresponding groups. While the significance cannot be denied, it was concluded that this statistical significance was more a product of statistical power (very large n) than of a major bias in the distribution ranks.

TABLE 28
DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION AND THE SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS BY ACADEMIC RANK

	Academic Rank					
	Professor		Associate		Assistant	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Population	909	22.2	1578	38.5	1224	29.9
Respondents	380	25.2	478	39.1	343	28.0

	Instructor		Librarian	
	#	%	#	%
Population	371	9.1	18	0.4
Respondents	90	7.4	5	0.4

$\chi^2 = 10.48.77$, df = 4

Another procedure for detecting biased results for a less than 100 percent return is to undertake a sample of nonrespondents. Such sample of fifty nonrespondents was randomly obtained from the list of all nonrespondents. Data on the number of years of

service at the institution, academic discipline, and academic rank was available from college catalogs for twenty-nine, forty-six, and forty-six respectively of the original fifty nonrespondents. Appropriate statistical tests with these variables between respondents and nonrespondents all proved to be nonsignificant (see Table 29). Therefore we concluded that no bias existed between the respondents and nonrespondents at least in these three characteristics.

One last test for bias in the return was conducted. The distributions of respondents for each of the four questionnaire mailings were examined for agreement with the theoretical proportions provided by the population vote for both voting behavior and academic rank (Table 30). Of the eight distributions tested, only one, that for academic rank on the first mailing, produced a significant chi-square ($\chi^2 = 20.8$, df = 3). As with the test of theoretical proportions for all respondents by academic rank (Table 28), the discrepancy which was most influential in creating this difference was the greater proportion of professors in the first mailing over population professors. Thus, the slight bias found in Table 28 can be attributed to the higher rate of return by professors in the first mailing. In general, however, the distributions presented in Table 29 indicate that no bias was determined in the return rate of any of the four mailings for voting behavior, and no bias in the return rate for the second, third, and fourth mailings for academic rank.

Appendix C:

Classification of Academic Departments According to Academic Division

Arts and Humanities

Advertising
Communications
English
Fine and Applied Arts
Foreign Languages
Journalism
Library Science
Linguistics
Literature
Philosophy
Speech
Theology

Education

Audio-Visual
Elementary
Home Economics
Physical Education and Recreation
Rehabilitation
Secondary
Special

Sciences

Agriculture
Biological Sciences
Earth Science
Engineering
Forestry
Geography
Geology
Mathematics
Nursing
Oceanography
Physical Sciences

Social Sciences

Anthropology
Economics
History
Political Science
Pre-Law
Psychology
Public Administration
Social Work
Sociology

Business and Management Services

Accounting
Business
Commerce
Computer Science and Systems Analysis
Finance
Management
Marketing

Notes on the Authors

G. GREGORY LOZIER holds a D.Ed. from The Pennsylvania State University, and is a Research Associate in the Office of Budget and Planning of The Pennsylvania State University. Prior to this appointment, he served as a graduate assistant with the Center for the Study of Higher Education. Dr. Lozier has co-authored, with Dr. Mortimer, several publications dealing with the issues of academic collective bargaining. Other professional experience included several years as Dean of Men at Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, North Carolina.

KENNETH P. MORTIMER holds a Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. He was employed by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley, where he participated in project research concerned with academic decision making. He has co-authored publications on faculty participation in university governance and academic decision making. In addition to his Center appointment, Dr. Mortimer is Associate Professor of Higher Education in the College of Education.

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

The Center for the Study of Higher Education was established in January 1969 to study higher education as an area of scholarly inquiry and research. Dr. G. Lester Anderson, its director, is aided by a staff of twenty, including five full-time researchers, and a cadre of advanced graduate students and supporting staff.

The Center's studies are designed to be relevant not only to the University and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but also to colleges and universities throughout the nation. The immediate focus of the Center's research falls into the broad areas of governance, graduate and professional education, and occupational programs in two-year colleges.

Research reports, monographs, and position papers prepared by staff members of the Center can be obtained on a limited basis. Inquiries should be addressed to the Center for the Study of Higher Education, 101 Rackley Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Monographs

Variability in Faculty Perceptions of the Legitimacy of Decision Making at Nine Pennsylvania Institutions, David W. Leslie, November 1973.

Human Services Occupations in the Two-Year College: A Handbook, Theodore E. Kiffer and Martha Burns, May 1972.

Institutional Self-Study at The Pennsylvania State University, Kenneth P. Mortimer and David W. Leslie (eds.), December 1971.

Numbered Reports

The Comm-Bacc Study: Postbaccalaureate Activities of Degree Recipients from Pennsylvania Institutions 1971-1972, William Toombs, August 1973, Report No. 23.

Students and Unions, Neil S. Bucklew, July 1973, Report No. 22.

Compensatory Education in Two-Year Colleges, James L. Morrison and Reynolds Ferrante, April 1973, Report No. 21.

Pennsylvania's "State-Owned" Institutions: Some Dimensions of Degree Output, William Toombs and Stephen D. Millman, February 1973, Report No. 20.

The Trend Toward Government Financing of Higher Education Through Students: Can the Market Model be Applied?, Larry L. Leslie, January 1973, Report No. 19. (Out of print.)

The Rationale for Various Plans for Funding American Higher Education, Larry L. Leslie, June 1972, Report No. 18.

Collective Bargaining: Implications for Governance, Kenneth P. Mortimer and G. Gregory Lozier, July 1972, Report No. 17.

Productivity and the Academy: The Current Condition, William Toombs, May 1972, Report No. 16. (Out of print.)

Exceptional Graduate Admissions at The Pennsylvania State University, Manual G. Gunne and Larry L. Leslie, March 1972, Report No. 15.

The Quality of Graduate Studies: Pennsylvania and Selected States, Stephen D. Millman and William Toombs, February 1972, Report No. 14.

Reports 1-13 out of print.

Conference Reports

The Fourth Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Postsecondary Occupational Education, Angelo C. Gillie, (ed.) August 1973.

Bibliographies

Selected Bibliography in Higher Education, September 1969, Revised April 1972.

Occasional Papers

Ralph L. Boyers in collaboration with Robert E. Sweitzer, *Collective Bargaining in Pennsylvania: A Summary of Collective Bargaining Agreements*, August 1973.

Naomi V. Ross, *Community College Teacher Preparation Programs in the U.S.: A Bibliography with Introductory Notes*, August 1972.

U.Ed. 4-381